

NATION-WIDE MINERS' STRIKE STARTS

HARDING OUSTS
BUREAU CHIEFS
IN BIG SHAKEUP

Director of Engraving and
Printing Bureau Removed
by Executive Order.

ILL NAMED SUCCESSION

Heads of Every Division in
Bureau Removed Follow-
ing Investigation.

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Pres. L. Wilmeth, director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and a number of other executives of the bureau were removed "for the good of the service" Friday night by Pres't Harding through an executive order. Louis A. Hill, assistant chief of the division of Engravings, was named as the new director of the Bureau and all other vacancies were also filled.

The executive order affected executive heads of every distinction in the bureau and the action was taken it was explained, as the result of an extended investigation, and in connection with a complete readjustment of the bureau to peace time conditions. Mr. Hill was sworn in immediately went to the bureau and took charge. The new executive personnel will be in complete charge Saturday.

No Previous Intimation.
Mr. Wilmeth said he received the order upon its being promulgated by the president and that it was his first intimation he had of his dismissal. Mr. Hill, who assumed his duties at once at the bureau, said at no statement could be made other than that contained in the initial house announcement, but added that there would be considerable work to do in reorganizing the Bureau on a peace time basis. He declined to discuss the possibility of any change in policy.

It is understood that a complete inventory of now bonds, plates and other stock will be taken care of but nothing will be done merely as a matter of course or in connection with uninformative reports of the disappearance of some duplicate bonds not indicated Friday night.

Sweeping Changes.
Officials of the treasury department failed to throw any light on the dismissed order, saying the action and the brief announcement of its promulgation at the white house would have to speak for themselves. The changes, however, in bureau circles were regarded as sweeping and meant it was declared, the complete elimination of those who formerly had directed its operations.

Announcement was made Thursday of the dropping of several hundred men from the payroll of the bureau, but it was stated this had no connection with Friday night's action. The only exceptions Friday to dismissal in the executive order were in cases of persons eligible for retirement for age, all of whom were retired as of this date.

Mr. Wilmeth for years was chief clerk of the treasury and about four years ago was appointed chief of the bureau by Pres't Wilson, succeeding Joseph A. Ralph. The bureau is one of the largest in point of personnel in the executive branch of the government, employing about 6,600 persons. It operates a great engraving plant in the world, making all the paper money, bond certificates and securities of the government as well as the postage stamps.

Those dismissed said the order had come without any warning and was a complete surprise to them.

NASSAU FIRE CONFINED
TO HOTEL'S PROPERTY

WEST PALM BEACH, Fla., March 31.—Fire, which destroyed the Colonial hotel at Nassau in the Bahamas, and for a time threatened the destruction of many other buildings, was brought under control only after it had destroyed the hotel structure, the swimming pool, laundry, power houses and several other buildings on the hotel property, according to a wireless message received here Friday night by H. E. Forni, vice-president of the Florida East Coast Hotel Co., owner of the Nassau property. There were about 150 guests at the hotel at the time, most of whom came from New York, according to the message, but no lives were lost. The message did not contain an explanation of the origin of the fire.

TRESS IS SUED
FOR \$2,450,000

LOS ANGELES, Calif., March 31.—Oscar Hassen, better known as Humphrey Hassen, an actress, was sued for \$2,450,000 in an action filed in a superior court Friday by Arthur L. Roth, New York attorney for his late former husband.

Prince Ibrahim Hassen of whom she had married in 1910, he declares he obtained \$500,000.

Hassen, Roth asserts, agreed him fifty per cent of what he obtained.

CHARLES WORSE

HAL. Madena, March 31.—Edition of former Charles of Hungary, who is suffering from amnesia, Friday took a turn worse.

Starving Russians
Steal Dead Bodies

NEW YORK, March 31.—Graphic stories of starvation and cannibalism in Soviet Russia were brought Friday by three men who arrived on steamers from Europe after tours of the famine district.

Two, Simon Bradley of Washington, and Morris D. Barron of Brooklyn, who returned on the Polonia, had gone to Russia to rescue relatives, who, they heard, were starving. The third was Prof. M. Atkinson, head of the department of economics in Melbourne university, Australia, who entered Russia as a representative of the British dominions famine relief. He was a passenger on the Mauretania.

Bradley said he found his brother, Peter, formerly a prosperous grain exporter of Moscow, starving in a little town 200 miles from that city. His business and all his resources had been swept away during the revolution, and he was at the point of death when Bradley found him, he said. Bradley said he was horrified at the suffering he observed while searching for his brother, but that despite conditions there, Peter declined to leave his native land. He provided him with funds with which he could obtain food from the American relief.

Barlow said he found two sisters at Riga, penniless and on the verge of starvation. But they, like Peter Bradley, preferred to remain in Russia, so he made provisions for their maintenance.

Cannibalism Rampant.
Prof. Atkinson declared he had established to his complete satisfaction.

(Continued on page two.)

STATE BRINGS SUIT
AGAINST CIGAR CO.
FOR PROFITEERING

Delaware County Prosecutor
Seeks Revocation of Indiana
Certificate.

MUNCIE, Ind., March 31.—Following a grand jury investigation of alleged profiteering, a suit on behalf of the prosecuting attorney of Delaware county, was filed against the United Cigar Stores Co. of America in circuit court here Friday, charging that the company has violated its certificate of authority to do business in Indiana and asking that the right of the concern to operate in Muncie and other Indiana cities be revoked; that a lease on a certain piece of real estate here be revoked, and that a receiver be appointed for the corporation.

The complaint alleges that the company, which is a New Jersey corporation, has leased a building here and has sublet it, in violation of the certificate of authority. This certificate, it is said, gives the right to sell tobacco, cigar, cigarette, smokers' items and kindred articles, but prohibits the holding of real estate, except as may be necessary for the carrying on of its legitimate business.

A further allegation is that the corporation profited in the subletting of the building, making an annual profit of \$6,000 on it and "collecting, exacting and extorting excessive and unlawful profits and rents."

Because of this alleged violation and the profiteering, the suit contends that the certificate of authority is forfeited. If successful, the suit would force the closing of all stores of the company in Indiana. It is estimated that a suit to demand forfeiture of from \$1,000 to \$10,000 by the corporation for violation of its authority may be instituted.

Miss Stone Tells Jury Only
Purpose Was to Secure Mar-
riage to Kinhead.

NEW YORK, March 31.—Admitting authorship of letters in which threats were made to kill Ellis Guy Kinhead, former corporation counsel of Cincinnati, for whose murder last summer she is on trial, Miss Olivia M. P. Stone Friday told a supreme court jury that her sole intent was to scare the lawyer into leading her to the altar for a ceremonial marriage.

It has been her contention that Kinhead refused to go through the ceremony with her after their alleged common law marriage almost four years ago. From time to time he promised to her, she said, but put off the day and finally he abandoned her and married another woman, Marie Louise Gormley.

"No matter what extravagant language you used, your only intention was to make him right that wrong, wasn't it?" she was asked by her lawyer.

"Yes, I swear by all that is good and holy that that is the truth," she said, raising her right arm above her head.

"God knows it is true," she added, but her answer was stricken out, save for the mere "yes."

All day the trained nurse was on the stand, weak and distressed to almost constant tears. She admitted writing the letters during cross examination and explained their purpose after her counsel took up the questioning.

Her lawyer brought out that she went to several Cincinnati lawyers with her troubles that she took them to the dean of the Cincinnati law school where Kinhead was an instructor, and that he subsequently lost his position. Because of Kinhead's standing in the profession, she said, she got little encouragement from the lawyers. This statement was eliminated from the record.

Jackson, Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

Plea of Burch's Lawyers to
Have Entire Panel Re-
moved Is Denied.

LOS ANGELES, Calif., March 31.—At the resumption of the trial of Arthur C. Burch, charged with the murder of J. Bolton Kennedy today, Paul W. Schenck, chief defense attorney, submitted affidavits in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,

to a affidavit in support of challenge directed at the jury panel. Am. org. challenge,